

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
OF THE STATE OF OREGON

THAN EXAMILOTIS and NICOLE EXAMILOTIS,
Petitioners,

vs.

COOS COUNTY,
Respondent,

and

COOS COUNTY STEP COMMISSION,
Intervenor-Respondent.

LUBA No. 2006-205

FINAL OPINION
AND ORDER

Appeal from Coos County.

Daniel J. Stotter, Eugene, represented petitioners.

Jacqueline Haggarty, Coquille, represented respondent.

Dan Terrell, Eugene, represented intervenor-respondent.

RYAN, Board Member; HOLSTUN, Board Chair; BASSHAM, Board Member,
participated in the decision.

REMANDED

11/21/2007

You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is governed by the
provisions of ORS 197.850.

1 Ryan, Board Member.

2 **MOTION FOR VOLUNTARY REMAND**

3 This is the county’s second motion for voluntary remand. We denied the county’s
4 first motion for voluntary remand because the county failed to assert that it would address all
5 of the allegations set out in the petition for review. The county now asserts that it will
6 address all of the allegations in the petition for review on remand. Petitioners again object to
7 the motion for voluntary remand.

8 Where a petitioner objects to a local government’s motion for voluntary remand, we
9 will grant the motion if the local government asserts that it will address all of the allegations
10 set out in the petition for review. *Doob v. Josephine County*, 43 Or LUBA 130, 133 (2002).
11 Petitioners’ objections provide no basis to deny the motion for voluntary remand.

12 The county’s decision is remanded.